DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 085 CG 019 974

AUTHOR Weltman, Karen; Steil, Janice
TITLE Power Strategies: Determinants in Marital and Professional Relationships.
PUB DATE Aug 86
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (94th, Washington, DC, August 22-26, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; *Employer Employee Relationship; Interpersonal Competence; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Marriage; Power Structure; *Professional Personnel; *Sex Differences; *Spouses
IDENTIFIERS *Power Strategies

ABSTRACT

Power and influence are fundamental determinants of the direction and quality of interpersonal relationships. Research has shown that women tend to have less power than men in their intimate and professional relationships and that men are more likely than women to use direct strategies to achieve their goals. A study was conducted to investigate the determinants of and extent to which men and women use different power strategies in their marital and professional supervisory relationships. Thirty professional childless couples completed questionnaires assessing the comparability of their resources, their value orientations, self-confidence, and the extent to which they reportedly used direct and indirect strategies in their relationships. Findings showed that both men and women used direct as compared to indirect strategies more frequently in both professional and intimate relationships. Furthermore, there were no differences in the frequency with which men and women said they used direct and indirect strategies in their professional capacities. However, wives reported using indirect strategies more frequently in their marital relationships than did husbands. Higher age levels, greater self-confidence, higher endorsement of autonomy, achievement, and dominance as well as higher absolute and relative salaries were associated with less frequent use of indirect strategies by wives. Several tables are provided. (Author/NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED283085

Power Strategies:
Determinants in Marital and Professional Relationships

Karen Weltman and Janice Steil
Adelphi University
Institute of Advanced
Psychological Studies

CG 019974

Paper presented at the meeting of the
American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.
August, 1986

Running Head: Power Strategies

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Karen Weltman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Abstract

This study investigated the determinants of and extent to which men and women use different power strategies in their marital and professional supervisory relationships. Thirty professional couples completed questionnaires assessing the comparability of their resources, their value orientations, self-confidence, and the extent to which they reportedly used direct and indirect strategies in their relationships. Findings showed that both men and women used direct as compared to indirect strategies more frequently in both professional and intimate relationships. Furthermore, there were no differences in the frequency with which men and women said they used direct and indirect strategies in their professional capacities. However, wives reported using indirect strategies more frequently in their marital relationships than did husbands. Higher age levels, greater self-confidence, higher endorsement of autonomy, achievement, and dominance as well as higher absolute and relative salaries were associated with less frequent use of indirect strategies by wives.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Power, the capacity to affect another, and influence, the use of that capacity, are fundamental determinants of the direction and quality of interpersonal relationships. Yet, women generally have less power than men in their intimate (Cromwell & Olson, 1975; Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Gillespie, 1971; Johnson, 1976) as well as in their professional (Bowman, Worthy, & Greyser, 1966; Johnson, 1978; Nieva & Gutek, 1981; Orth & Jacobs, 1971) relationships. Consistent with this power imbalance, men and women also tend to use different influence strategies. Recent studies have reported that men are more likely than women to use direct strategies (e.g. asking, reasoning, telling) to achieve their goals. Women, on the other hand, are said to use indirect strategies (i.e. suggesting, negative affect, positive affect) more frequently (Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Feldman, 1981; Johnson, 1976; Offerman & Schrier, 1985). Strategy use and amount and sources of power are reportedly related. Greater power, as well as access to more concrete (i.e. income, occupational prestige) resource bases have been associated with more frequent use of direct strategies (Eagly & Wood, 1982; Instone, Major & Bunker, 1983; Johnson, 1976; Rank, 1982). Less power and reliance on more personal (warmth, affection) resource bases have been associated with more frequent use of indirect strategies.

The implications of gender associated differences in the use of influence strategies are significant. Direct strategies are generally regarded as more effective than indirect strategies (Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Johnson, 1976). As well, the use of indirect strategies is said to be costly to self-esteem and

serves to maintain a user's subordinated and dependent position (Johnson, 1976).

While the fact of gender associated differences has been fairly well-documented, the reasons for these differences have not. Various explanations have been posed including differences in men's and women's resources (Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Eagly & Wood, 1982; Instone, Major, & Bunker, 1983; Rank, 1982), in their value orientations (Gilligan, 1982), and self-confidence levels (Instone, Major, & Bunker, 1983; Mowday, 1979) as well as differences in gender socialization (Falbo, Hazen, Linimon, 1982; Johnson, 1976) and gender stereotypes (Broverman et al., 1972, Eagly & Wood, 1982). Yet, there has been little systematic investigation of the explanatory power of these theoretical positions. This study focused on the issue of differential strategy use. It sought to assess the extent to which differential strategy use is maintained amongst a non-traditional sample in which the women have access to a broad range of resources at a level comparable to the men. As well, this sample allowed us to better assess the predictive value of the various theoretical perspectives.

Resource Theory

Resource theory (Blood & Wolfe, 1960) maintains that power accrues in proportion to the amount and value of the resources contributed (e.g. income, occupational status as well as demographics such as age and educational level). This perspective explains women's lower levels of power in terms of their traditionally limited access to outside (particularly, economic)

resources. As well, according to some (Gillespie, 1971; Kidder et. al. in Lerner, 1981) the power imbalance is exacerbated by the fact that traditionally female contributions (i.e. nurturance, relationship maintenance) have been undervalued. Consistent with this perspective, research has shown that the greater a husbands' income and job prestige, the more say he has at home (Gillespie, 1971). Similarly, women who work for pay generally have more influence in their intimate relationships than women who do not (Bird, 1979; Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983; Rank, 1982; Steil, 1984) but their influence levels decline when they have children (Gillespie, 1971; See Steil (1983) for a review; Also Steil & Turetsky, 1986).

Value Orientation

Differences in the use of power have been explained in terms of gender associated differences in value orientation. According to this perspective, power has different meanings for men and women. Women, it is said, regard power in terms of their responsibility and care for others. Men, it is said, are more likely to perceive power in terms of assertion, aggression and achievement strivings (Gilligan, 1982). These values differentially affect both the type and frequency of influence attempts.

Self-confidence

Research suggests that women are typically less confident than men. (Instone, Major, & Bunker, 1983; Johnson, 1978). As

well, it has been shown that individuals high in self-confidence exercise influence more frequently (Instone, Major, & Bunker, 1983; Mowday, 1979). According to this perspective, then women may have more difficulty exercising power directly. Consequently, they are more likely to use indirect and less effective power strategies (Instone, Major, & Bunker, 1983; Johnson, 1978).

Socialization

A fourth position merely posits that women are more likely to be socialized to use less direct forms of influence (Johnson, 1976). Moreover, women are typically characterized as compliant, submissive, emotional, indecisive, dependent, passive, and non-competitive (Bardwick & Douvan, 1971; Broverman et al., 1970). These stereotypes are consistent with indirect forms of influence. In addition, the use of more direct forms of influence, like any role inconsistent behavior, may be subject to social sanctions (Falbo, Hazen, & Linimon, 1982; Johnson, 1978). From this perspective then, women are socialized to be powerless and this behavior is maintained by disapproval of role inconsistent behavior.

The Study and Hypotheses

In light of these differing perspectives, this study asked whether gender differences in strategy use would persist amongst a group of highly educated, high-achieving group of men and women. High education levels and high achievement levels would be likely to insure men and women's access to valued economic and status resources and, furthermore, maximize the likelihood of

high confidence levels. This study investigated respondents' intimate as well as professional supervisory relationships and asked if differences in strategy use do exist, what are the best predictors of these differences?

The hypotheses were:

I) A. Men will typically employ more direct strategies than women in both their marital and professional relationships.

B. Women will typically employ indirect strategies more frequently than men.

II) Both men and women will employ direct strategies more frequently in their professional relationships than in their marital relationships.

III) Men and women with greater resources (higher income relative to spouse, higher absolute income, older age level) than their peers will be:

A. more likely to use direct strategies in the marital context, and

B. less likely to use indirect strategies in the marital context.

IV) For both men and women, the greater the confidence, autonomy, achievement, and dominance levels:

A. the more frequent use of direct influence strategies, and

B. the less frequent use of indirect influence strategies.

V) Due to the undervaluing of affiliation and nurturance, higher endorsement of this value indice will be associated with the more frequent use of indirect influence strategies.

Procedure

Subject recruitment procedures relied heavily on a snowball effect. A few subjects were recruited by contacting various professional women's organizations including the Women's Bar Association of the State of New York and the 57th Street Study Club (a group for women dentists). At the initial contact, potential participants were informed of the inclusion criteria. Respondents had to be married for at least one year. Since the presence of children differentially affects the influence of wives as compared to husbands (Gillespie, 1971), couples had to be childless. Both the husbands and the wives had to work in a supervisory capacity. Supervisory was defined as responsible for delegating work to another or actually supervising another at work. There also had to be a 1/3 salary differential. In half of the sample (15 couples), the husbands earned at least 30% more than their wives. In the other half of the sample (15 couples), the wife's income exceeded her husband's by at least 30%. This enabled us to examine a group in which half of the women were contributing greater economic resources to the household than were their husbands and allowed us to control for traditional gender related discrepancies in economic and job status resources.

For those who met the inclusion criteria, an interview appointment was made at the respondents' convenience. All respondents completed the instruments in the presence of the interviewer. Interview time was approximately 30-45 minutes at

the conclusion of which subjects had the opportunity to ask questions and were informed of the study's purpose.

Resources were assessed by a Personal Information Questionnaire which asked respondents their age, education, and salary level as well as their job title, the number of people for whom they had supervisory responsibility and their perceptions of how they were faring (their relative success) at work. Items addressing relative equality of their marital relationship were also included.

Value orientation and self-confidence levels were assessed through administration of the affiliation, nurturance, autonomy, achievement, dominance and self-confidence subscales of the Gough and Heilbrun (1965) Adjective Checklist. Subsequently, a Pearson correlation was performed which showed that the affiliation and nurturance scales were positively correlated ($R=.75$, $p<.001$) with each other as were the autonomy ($R=.48$, $p<.001$, $R=.62$, $p<.001$), achievement ($R=.82$. $p<.001$, $R=.48$, $p<.001$), and dominance ($R=.82$, $p<.001$, $R=.62$, $p<.001$) scales (Table 1). Consequently these five scales were collapsed into a nurturance and affiliation index which had an internal reliability of .82 (Cronbach's alpha) and a dominance, achievement, and autonomy index which had an internal reliability of .84. These two indices were negatively but not significantly correlated with each other ($R=-.15$, $p>.10$).

Two 13-item scales based on the findings of Falbo (1977) were used to address respondents' perceptions of the extent to which they used particular power strategies in their marital and supervisory relationships. Falbo's model was devised on the

basis of essays written on the topic, "how I get my way". Each item in our scales consisted of a particular strategy (e.g. asking) accompanied by an example of this strategy (e.g. I ask him/her to do what I want.). Responses were made on a 5-point continuum ranging from (1) "not at all" to (5) "a great deal". According to Falbo (1977), strategies fall into four factors (direct bilateral, direct unilateral, indirect bilateral, indirect unilateral). Our Principal-components factor analysis did not support this grouping. The subject number was relatively small for this procedure, however. The relationship of the items was also examined through four Pearson correlations: one for males and one for females in each of the two contexts (i.e. work and home). This analysis showed some empirical justification of the direct (Table 2) and indirect dimension (Table 3), though not the unilateral-bilateral dimension. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the direct and indirect strategy measures, respectively, were as follows: marital context, .65 and .45; and work context, .58 and .65. As labelled by Falbo, the direct strategies were asking, bargaining, persistence, persuasion, reasoning, stating importance, talking, and telling. The indirect strategies were: laissez-faire, negative affect, positive affect, suggesting, and withdrawal. Mean scores on each of these dimensions were calculated for each respondent.

Results

Subjects. Thirty white married childless heterosexual couples (30 men and 30 women) employed in professional supervisory positions participated. Subjects had been married for an average

of 3.86 years. They ranged in age from 24 to 44 with mean ages of 33.1 (men) and 31.9 (women). Subjects were highly educated (the average level of education was at the masters level) and highly salaried (the average income was over $50,000). Among the most common occupational positions held by subjects were lawyer (18%), advertising executive (12%), investment banker (12%), psychologist (10%) and management consultant (8%). Respondents' occupations were assigned prestige scores on the basis of a scale devised by Bose and Rossi (1983). An initial interrater reliability of 94% was achieved. Discrepancies were subsequently resolved through discussion between the raters so that a single prestige score could be assigned to the remaining 6% of the subjects. Subjects mean prestige score was 81.94 on a scale ranging from 5 to 96. The prestige level of the positions that subjects held was indeed quite high.

Demographic Differences Between the Men and Women Respondents

A series of t-tests comparing respondent characteristics showed that there were no significant differences between men's and women's occupational prestige levels or salaries, nor their self-confidence, autonomy, achievement, dominance or affiliation and nurturance scores (Table 4). The men were, however, about one year older ($t(58)=-2.04$, $p=.05$) and were more highly educated than the women ($t(58)=-3.25$, $p<.05$).

Power Strategies

The relationship between power strategies and the predictor variables were first assessed by separate Pearson correlations for men and women in each context. Separate Stepwise Regression

Analyses were performed for men and women in each context to assess the predictive value of those variables found to be highly correlated with the criterion variables, i.e indirect and direct influence strategies. The number of steps in each equation was contingent upon the number of significant predictor variables. Subsequent to this procedure, all predictor variables were forced into the regression equation one at a time to assess possible confounding influences as well as to assess the unique variance contributed by all of these variables. Those variables with the lowest F probability were entered into the equation first.

While Hypothesis IA predicted that men would typically employ direct strategies more frequently than women in both their marital and professional relationships, the results demonstrated that there were no differences in the frequency with which men and women reported using direct strategies in either context. Whether at work or at home women reported use of direct strategies as frequently as men did. Hypothesis IB predicted that women would use indirect strategies more frequently than men. This hypothesis was only partially supported. Wives reported using indirect strategies at home more frequently than their husbands did ($t(58)=2.33$, $p<.05$). A regression analysis showed that age (beta=-.37, $F(1,58)=9.73$, $p<.01$), the autonomy, achievement, and dominance values (beta=-.38, $F(2,57)=10.37$, $p<.01$), and sex (beta=.27, $F(3,56)=6.32$, $p<.05$) were the strongest predictors of frequency of use of indirect strategies in marriage. Thus, women and those, who were younger and were lower in the autonomy, achievement, and dominance values, were

more likely to report the greater use of indirect strategies. In their professional capacities, however, women reported using indirect strategies no more frequently than did the men ($t(58)=.79$, $p>.10$).

The second hypothesis proposed that both men and women would employ direct strategies more frequently in their work relationships than in their marital relationships. This hypothesis was not supported. Both men and women used direct strategies more frequently than indirect strategies in both contexts and used direct strategies more frequently at home than at work ($F(1,119)=4.96$, $p<.05$).

Hypothesis IIIA stated that both men and women with greater resources would be more likely to use direct strategies in the marital context than would their peers with lesser resources. This hypothesis was partially supported for the husbands ($t(28)=-2.79$, $p<.01$) but not at all for the wives. Husbands who had a higher income relative to their spouses ($R=-.41$, $p<.01$) reported the more frequent use of direct strategies (Table 5). Contrary to expectations, younger husbands also reported the more frequent use of direct strategies ($R=-.39$, $p<.05$). Regression analyses (Table 7) showed age remained strongly predictive of use of direct strategies (beta=-.45, $F(2,27)=5.90$, $p<.05$) and explained 14% of the variance. Husbands' higher income relative to spouse explained 17% of the variance, but did not reach conventional levels of significance in predicting more frequent use of direct strategies (beta=-.41, $F(1,28)=3.86$, $p<.10$). Its strong correlation with other variables in the equation, e.g.

absolute salary (R=-.59, p<.001), detracted from its unique variance.

Hypothesis IIIB stated that men and women with greater resources would be less likely to use indirect strategies. Pearson correlations showed no relationship between husbands' economic resource level and their likelihood of using indirect strategies but age was correlated with the use of indirect strategies (R=-.31, p<.05) (Table 5). Older husbands reported the less frequent use of indirect strategies. However, for wives, age as well as economic resources were related to the use of indirect strategies. Those, who were older (R=-.54, p<.001), had a higher absolute salary (R=-.40, p<.05), and had a higher income relative to spouse (R=.32, p<.05) reported the less frequent use of indirect strategies (Table 5). In the regression analyses, only age remained strongly predictive of women's use of indirect strategies in marriage (beta=-.41, $\underline{F}(2,27)=7.03$, p<.05) (Table 6) explaining 20% of the variance.

Hypothesis IVA proposed that higher levels of self-confidence and endorsement of autonomy, achievement, and dominance would be associated with more frequent use of direct influence strategies at home and at work. This hypotheses was not supported for husbands nor wives in either context (Table 5).

Hypothesis IVB predicted that men and women with higher levels of confidence as well as higher levels of autonomy, achievement, and dominance would use indirect strategies less frequently. For men, both higher confidence levels (R=-.36, p<.05) and greater endorsement of the autonomy, achievement, and

dominance values ($R=-.35$, $p<.05$) were significantly associated with the less frequent use of indirect strategies at home but not at work (Table 5). However, neither of these variables were shown to be strong predictors of indirect strategy use at home when examined by a regression analysis (Table 6).

For women, Pearson correlations showed that higher self-confidence ($R=-.54$, $p<.001$) and greater endorsement of the autonomy, achievement, and dominance values ($R=-.55$, $p<.001$) were associated with the less frequent use of indirect strategies at home (Table 5). When all of the predictor variables were entered in a regression analysis, both self-confidence and the autonomy, achievement, and dominance indice lost their predictive value. Because self-confidence and the autonomy, achievement, and dominance values were so highly correlated with each other ($R=.78$, $p<.001$), they no longer contributed any unique variance. At work, greater self-confidence ($R=-.33$, $p<.05$) and stronger endorsement of the autonomy, achievement, and dominance values ($R=-.53$, $p<.01$) were also associated with women's less frequent use of indirect strategies (Table 5). However, only the greater autonomy, achievement, and dominance index remained predictive of women's less frequent use of indirect strategies (beta=-.80, $F(1,28)=5.97$, $p<.05$) (Table 6) explaining 28% of the variance.

Hypothesis V proposed a relationship between high levels of affiliation and nurturance and the more frequent use of indirect influence strategies at home and at work. This hypotheses was not supported for men nor women in either context (Table 5). Surprisingly, though, higher affiliation and nurturance levels

were borne out as significant predictors of women's more frequent use of direct strategies at work (beta=.57, $F(6,23)=4.72$, $p<.05$) (Table 7).

Success at Work

We also examined whether the use of direct or indirect strategies was differentially associated with men and women's perceptions of success at work. This was measured by items on the Personal Information Questionnaire addressing how one fared at work in comparison to others regarding compensation, promotion, influence in decision-making, and relative responsibility levels. The relationship between success at work and the power strategies was examined by Pearson correlations. Stepwise Regressions were then performed to assess the predictive value of the variables. For men, favorable promotions were associated both with more frequent use of direct strategies ($R=-.33$, $p<.05$) and less frequent use of indirect strategies ($R=.43$, $P<.01$). For women, there was no relationship between frequency of use of direct strategies and any of our measures of success at work. More frequent use of indirect strategies, however, was associated with lower perceptions of success (e.g. promotion ($R=.38$, $p<.05$), responsibility ($R=.44$, $p<.01$), and less influence in decision-making ($R=.39$, $p<.05$)). None of the variables were predictive when entered in a regression analysis.

Summary and Conclusion

Our findings indicated that subjects used all strategies more frequently in their marital as compared to their work relationships. This is not surprising as one would expect that a

wider range of strategies is acceptable in intimate relationships. In both contexts, i.e. at home and at work, both men and women reported using direct strategies more frequently than indirect strategies. It is important to note as well that women in this sample reported using direct strategies as frequently as men did in both their intimate and professional relationships.

There were also no differences in men and women's use of influence strategies at work. This finding is consistent with the work of others (Offerman & Schrier, 1985) who found no differences in the reported use of influence strategies by managerial men and women. In the work environment, where roles are more structurally defined, women may be able to cross stereotypic lines and feel entitled to use the same strategies as are used by others with status and authority.

The major difference in strategy use occurred at home where wives reported using indirect strategies more frequently than did their husbands. The use of indirect forms of influence is usually the strategy of those with comparatively less power (Falbo and Peplau 1980; Johnson, 1976,1978; Offerman & Schrier, 1985). Consistent with this notion, both the husbands and wives in our sample reported that wives had less say, compared to their husbands, in the home. It may be then that women are more able to achieve equality in their work context, where at least some forms of power are structurally defined and achieved, as compared to the home context where power is more informally and normatively ascribed.

The greater the wife's resources (higher age level as well as higher absolute income and higher income relative to spouse), the more self-confidence she reported having, and the more she characterized herself as high in autonomy, achievement, and dominance. These variables were also associated with less frequent use of indirect strategies. Age was the single strongest predictor. Thus, it may be that as these women became older and had the opportunity to achieve, they also became more self-confident and used indirect strategies less frequently. Higher absolute salary and higher salary relative to spouse were also associated with less frequent use of indirect strategies. This result supports the resource orientation and is consistent with the considerable body of literature that shows that women who work for pay have more influence at home than those who do not (Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Gillespie, 1971; Rank, 1982; Steil, 1984). Yet, resources alone were not the whole story. Perhaps, contributing a significant portion of the finances gives a greater sense of entitlement to women in the home context. On the other hand, women, who feel more self-confident and are more autonomy, achievement, and dominance oriented, may be more apt to place themselves in positions in which they have greater potential to be paid higher salaries and demand a greater say at home.

Our sample is, of course, uniquely high-achieving. The women, as well as the men, are in professional as well as mostly high paying supervisory positions. This was partly a consequence of our sampling criteria that required that half the women earn

at least one-third more than their husbands. It is important to note that this group allowed us a more adequate test of the role of resources and values separate from gender in predicting the use of differential power strategies in relationships.

References

Bardwick, J.M. & Douvan, E. (1971). Ambivalence: the socialization of women. In Gornick, V. & Moran, B. (eds.). Woman in sexist society. New York: Basic Books, 225-241.

Bird, C. (1979). The two paycheck marriage. New York: Rawson Wade Publishers.

Blood, R.O. & Wolfe, D.M. (1960). Husbands and wives. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Blumstein, P. & Schwartz, P. (1983). American Couples. New York: William Morrow and Company.

Bose, C.E. & Rossi, P.A. (1983). Gender and jobs: prestige standings of occupations as affected by gender. American Sociological Review, 48, 316-330.

Bowman, G.W., Worthy, B., & Greyser, S.A. (1965). Are women executives people? Harvard Business Review, 43(4).

Broverman, I.K., Broverman, D.M., Clarkson, F.E., Rosenkrantz, P.S., & Vogel, S.R. (1970). Sex role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34, 1-7.

Broverman, I.K., Vogel, S.R., Broverman, D.M., Clarkson, F.E., & Rosenkrantz, P.S. (1972). Sex-role stereotypes: a current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 28(2). 59-78.

Cromwell, R.E. & Olson, D.H. (eds.) (1975). Power in families. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Eagly, A.H. & Wood, W. (1982). Inferred sex differences in status as a determinant of gender stereotypes about social influence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43(5), 915-928.

Falbo, T. (1977). Multidimensional scaling of power strategies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 537-547.

Falbo, T. (1982). PAQ Types and power strategies used in intimate relationships. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 6(4). 399-405.

Falbo, T. Hazen, M.D. & Linimon, D. (1982). The costs of selecting power bases or messages associated with the opposite sex. Sex Roles, 8, 147- 157.

Falbo, T. & Peplau, L.A. (1980). Power strategies in intimate relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 618-628.

Feldman, L.B. (1982). Sex roles and family dynamics. In F. Walsh (Ed.). Normal Family Processes, New York: Guilford Press.

Gillespie, D.L. (1971). Who has the power: the marital struggle. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33, 445-458.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a Different Voice. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Heer, D. (1958). Dominance and the working wife. Social Forces, 36(2), 341-347.

Horwitz, A.V. (1982). Sex-role expectations, power, and psychological distress. Sex Roles, 8(6), 1982, 607-623.

Instone, D. Major, B., & Bunker, B.B. (1983). Gender, self-confidence, and social influence strategies: an organizational simulation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44(2), 322-333.

Johnson, P. (1976). Women and power: toward a theory of effectiveness. Journal of Social Issues, 32(3), 99-109.

Johnson, P. (1978). Women and interpersonal power. In I.H. Frieze, J.E. Parsons, P.B. Johnson, D.N. Ruble, & G.L. Zellman (Eds.), Women and Sex Roles. New York: Norton.

Kidder, L., Fagan, M., & Cohen, E. (1981). Giving and receiving: social justice in close relationships. In M. Lerner & S. Lerner (Eds.), The Justice Motive in Social Behavior: Adapting to Times of Scarcity and Social Change, 235-256, New York: Plenum .

Mowday, R.T. (1979). Leader characteristics, self-confidence, and methods of upward influence in organization decision situations. Academy of Management Journal. 22(4), 709-725.

Nieva, V. & Gutek, B. (1981). Women and Work: A Psychological Perspective, New York: Praeger.

Offerman, L.R. & Schrier, P.E. (1985). Social influence strategies: the impact of sex, role, and attitudes toward power. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 11(3), 286-300.

Orth, C.D. & Jacobs, F. (1971). Women in management: pattern for change. Harvard Business Review, 49(4), 139-147.

Rank, M.R. (1982). Determinants of conjugal influence in wives' employment decision making. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44(3), 591-604.

Steil, J.M. (1983). Marriage: an unequal partnership. In B. Wolman & G. Stricker (eds.). Handbook of Family and Marital Therapy. New York: Plenum, 49-60.

Steil, J.M. (1984). Marital relationships and mental health: the psychic costs of inequality. In J. Freeman (ed.) Women: A Feminist Perspective. Mayfield Press. 113-123.

Steil, J.M. & Turetsky, B. (1986). Marital equality and psychological symptomatology: Is equal better? In S. Oskamp (ed.) The Applied Social Psychology Annual.

Stitt, C., Schmidt, S., Price, K., & Kipnis, D. (1983). Sex of leader, leader behavior, and subordinate satisfaction. Sex Roles, 9, 32-42.

Torrey, J.W. (1973). A psychologist's look at women. Journal of Contemporary Business, 2(3), 25-40.

U.S. Department of Labor. (1982). U.S. Working Women. U.S. Government Printing Office.

TABLE 1

Intercorrelations of the two value indices

Achievement, Autonomy, & Dominance	1	2	3
1. Achievement	1.00		
2. Autonomy	.48***	1.00	
3. Dominance	.82***	.62***	1.00
Affiliation & Nurturance			
1. Affiliation	1.00		
2. Nurturance	.75***	1.00	

*p< .05

**p< .01

***p< .001

TABLE 2

Intercorrelations of items forming the index of Direct Power Strategies

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Context									
Marriage									
1.	Asking	1.00							
2.	Bargaining	-.12	1.00						
3.	Persisting	.07	-.16	1.00					
4.	Persuading	.32**	-.03	.02	1.00				
5.	Reasoning	.48***	.07	.02	.54***	1.00			
6.	Stating	.25*	.02	.23*	.23*	.29*	1.00		
7.	Talking	.54***	.20	-.06	.15	.21	.08	1.00	
8.	Telling	.36**	.01	.37**	.08	.22*	.47***	.39**	1.00
Work									
1.	Asking	1.00							
2.	Bargaining	-.03	1.00						
3.	Persisting	.31**	-.40***	1.00					
4.	Persuading	.10	.16	.16	1.00				
5.	Reasoning	.14	.14	.11	.60***	1.00			
6.	Stating	-.07	-.04	.24*	.25*	.19	1.00		
7.	Talking	.01	.42***	-.11	.32**	-.40**	.24*	1.00	
8.	Telling	.34**	-.14	.35**	.02	-.02	-.02	.22*	1.00

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

TABLE 3

Intercorrelations of items forming the index of Indirect Power Strategies

		1	2	3	4	5
Context						
Marriage						
1.	Laissez-Faire	1.00				
2.	Negative Affect	.27*	1.00			
3.	Positive Affect	-.21	.15	1.00		
4.	Suggesting	-.29*	.08	.50***	1.00	
5.	Withdrawal	.25*	.29*	.26*	.14	1.00
Work						
1.	Laissez-Faire	1.00				
2.	Negative Affect	.18	1.00			
3.	Positive Affect	.21	.06	1.00		
4.	Suggesting	.14	.14	.50***	1.00	
5.	Withdrawal	.65***	.26*	.21	.35**	1.00

*p< .05
**p< .01
***p< .001

TABLE 4

A Comparison of the Demographic Characteristics of Women and Men Respondents

	Range	Overall Mean	Female Mean	Male Mean	t
Age	24-44	32.53	31.96	33.10	2.04*
Education (coded as 1-5)	Below B.A. level to J.D., Ph.D., M.D., D.D.S. level	Masters (3.00)	beyond undergraduate level (2.73)	beyond Masters level (3.27)	-3.25*
Salary coded as 1-5)	Below $25,000 to Over $75,000	Over $50,000 (3.22)	Over $50.000 (3.20)	Over 50,000 (3.23)	-.11
Years Married	1-12 years	3.86 years	---	---	---
No. of people supervised	1-40	6.88	6.13	7.63	-.90
No. of years supervisory capacity	1-22	6 years	6.07	9.03	-.92
Prestige (after interrater relationship established	63-95	81.94	81.16	82.72	-.79

*$p < .05$

TABLE 5

Pairwise correlations between predictor variables and frequency of use of direct and indirect strategies

	Direct Strategies				Indirect Strategies			
	In Marriage		At Work		In Marriage		At Work	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Age	-.16	-.39*	-.20	-.06	-.54***	-.31*	-.34*	-.45**
Achievement, Autonomy, Dominance Values	.08	.17	.10	.20	-.55***	-.35*	-.53**	-.24
Affiliation and Nurturance Values	.23	.07	.30	-.23	-.23	.06	.01	.09
Self-confidence	.03	.26	.07	.04	-.54***	-.36*	-.33*	-.22
Absolute Salary	-.10	.15	-.08	.02	-.40*	-.18	-.24	-.24
Salary relative to spouse	.16	-.41[1]**	.00	.00	.32[1]*	.00	.22	.07

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

***$p < .001$

[1]Relative Salary was recoded by using +1 for lower relative salary and -1 for higher relative salary

TABLE 6

Multiple Regression Analyses Determining the Best Predictors of Frequency of Men and Women's Indirect Strategy Use at Home and at Work

At Home	Women				Men			
Predictor Variables	Step	Beta	R2change	F	Step	Beta	R2change	F
Age	2	-.45	.20	7.03*	1	-.32	.06	2.40
Absolute Salary	5	-.01	.00	.00	4	-.04	.03	.02
Relative Salary	3	.16	.01	1.00	6	-.15	.02	.44
Self-confidence	4	.04	.01	.01	2	.41	.11	1.00
Autonomy, Achievement, Dominance	1	-.47	.31	2.49	3	.03	.01	.01
Affiliation & Nurturance	6	-.20	.02	.94	5	.17	.02	.52
At Work								
Predictor Variables								
Age	2	-.31	.07	2.97	1	-.45	.21	7.26**
Absolute Salary	5	.05	.00	.05	4	-.07	.02	.07
Relative Salary	6	.00	.00	.00	5	-.04	.00	.03
Self-confidence	3	.39	.03	1.02	3	-.21	.02	.28
Autonomy, Achievement, Dominance	1	-.80	.28	5.97*	6	.03	.01	.01
Affiliation & Nurturance	4	-.08	.00	.11	2	.21	.03	.82

*p< .05 **p< .01

TABLE 7

Multiple Regression Analyses Determining the Best Predictors of Frequency of Men and Women's Direct Strategy Use at Home and at Work

	Women				Men			
At Home								
Predictor Variables	Step	Beta	R2change	F	Step	Beta	R2change	F
Age	2	-.16	.02	.58	2	-.45	.14	5.90*
Absolute Salary	4	-.10	.01	.31	6	.01	.00	.00
Relative Salary	3	.15	.02	.49	1	-.41	.17	3.86
Self-confidence	6	-.55	.01	1.45	3	.05	.03	.82
Autonomy, Achievement, Dominance	5	.53	.02	1.97	4	.24	.00	.44
Affiliation & Nurturance	1	.44	.09	2.58	5	.29	.05	1.81
At Work								
Predictor Variables								
Age	4	.24	.03	1.44	4	-.11	.00	.26
Absolute Salary	6	.05	.01	.05	3	.15	.00	.28
Relative Salary	5	.06	.00	.08	5	.09	.00	.13
Self-confidence	2	-.54	.02	1.53	2	-.39	.00	.76
Autonomy, Achievement. Dominance	3	.49	.00	1.77	1	.50	.10	1.23
Affiliation & Nurturance	1	.57	.16	4.72*	6	-.05	.00	.03

*$p < .05$ **$p < .01$